REMARKS

Claims 1, 3-9, 11-16 are rejected under 35 USC 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shen et al. (US 6,414,661) in view of Hunter (US 6,441,560) and Yano et al. (US 6,317,138). Claims 13-16 are hereby cancelled. Reconsideration and allowance of the remaining claims is requested for the following reasons.

As claimed in independent claims 1 and 9, applicant's invention is directed to an active matrix OLED flat-panel color display and a method of driving a display that includes a plurality of light emitting elements for emitting light of different colors and associated control circuits; a programmable power supply connected to the control circuits; a separate sensor for sensing each color of light emitted by the display to produce a feedback signal for each color; and a display controller responsive to the respective feedback signals for programming the programmable power supply to compensate for changes in the light output from the light emitting elements.

Shen et al. disclose a method and apparatus for calibrating a display device that includes a sensor for sensing the light output of the display and a control circuit responsive to a signal produced by the sensor for adjusting the current to the display to achieve a desired light output. Shen et al. do not teach emitting light of different colors and a separate sensor for sensing each color as claimed by applicants.

Hunter discloses an active matrix OLED flat panel display that has a light sensor in the active control circuit of each pixel for adjusting the value of a voltage stored on the capacitor of the control circuit. Hunter does not discuss a color display device nor does he show a programmable power supply for driving the display.

Yano et al. disclose a large color video display device that is made up of a plurality of display units each having a plurality of color display elements. Corrections are made for variations in the brightness between display elements. Yano et al. do not disclose correcting different colors in the display elements separately using a separate sensor for each color as disclosed and claimed by applicant.

The Examiner argues that it would have been obvious to modify the method and apparatus of Shen et al. by providing a separate sensor for each light emitting element as taught by Hunter and says that the motivation for doing so would be to speed up and facilitate real-time calibration and control. Applicant disagrees for the following reason. Hunter teaches a separate sensor in the active matrix circuit of each pixel, but doesn't teach sending a feedback signal from the sensor to a programmable power supply that is external of the active matrix pixel circuits. If the apparatus of Shen et al. were to be modified in light of Hunter as suggested by the Examiner, the feedback signals from each of the sensors would be sent to an external control programmable power supply. This would require some means of routing a signal from each of the pixels in the display and a separately controlled programmable power supply for every pixel. The result would be a huge increase in the complexity of the display. This increase in complexity would mitigate against any suggestion of combining the Technique of Hunter with that of Shen et al.

The Examiner further argues that it would have been obvious to apply the teachings of Yano et al. to further modify the teachings of Shen et al. as modified in light of Hunter to result in a separate sensor for each color of light emitted by the display. Applicant disagrees for the following reason. Yano et al. teach correcting for variations of luminous brightness of each display element. The display elements described by Yano et al. include red, green and blue light emitters. Yano et al. do not teach, show, or suggest individually correcting the differently colored light emitters in the display elements. Thus, if Shen et al. as modified in light of Hunter were further modified in light of Yano et al., there would be one sensor for each display element, not one sensor for each light emitter in the display element. It must be concluded therefore that even if the combination of prior art suggested by the Examiner were motivated by the prior art, it would not result in applicants invention. Furthermore, it would appear that the combination suggested by the Examiner is motivated, not by the prior art, but by applicants disclosure.

In light of the arguments above, it is believed that claims 1 and 9 are allowable over the prior art. The remainder of the claims depend from claim 1 or 9 and are believed to be patentable for at least the same reasons.

It is believed that the claims in the application are allowable over the prior art and such allowance is respectfully requested.

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any fees in connection with this communication to Eastman Kodak Company Deposit Account No. 05-0225. ***A duplicate copy of this communication is enclosed.***

Respectfully submitted,

Thomas H. Close
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Registration No. 27,428

THC:cjm
Telephone: (585) 722-2396
Facsimile: (585) 477-4646